



UNITED STATES SPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trad Ark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

i.		STATES OF	•
APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY, DOCKET NO
08/712		CANNATA	R 14064.0001
•	At the state of the second		EXAMINER
	and the second	B5M1/0307	
	_ HENTY & JAMES		ARTUNIT PAPER NUMBER
801 SO	FIGUEROA STREE		~
LOS ANO	SELES CA .90017-	5434 . , , () . gr	2506
		and the same as	DATE MAILED: 03/07/97
This is a communicatio	n from the examiner in charge PATENTS AND TRADEMARK	of your application.	
7.		OFFICE ACTION SUMMAR	y
1877)		01 1 102 Pro 11011 00	
	nunication(s) filed on		
This action is FINAL		1. 1.	
_			acution as to the mosts is closed in
Since this application accordance with the	n is in condition for allowar practice under <i>Ex parte Q</i>	uayle, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213	ecution as to the merits is closed in
		~	month(s), or thirty days,
whichover is longer from	e abandoned. (35 U.S.C.	mmunication. Failure to respond v	within the period for response will cause obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR
Disposition of Claims	A GOVERNMENT SERVICE		
Claim(s) 1-57			is/are pending in the application
Of the above, claim	(8)		is/are withdrawn from consideration
Claim(s)	te ring a second		is/are allowed.
Claim(s) / 5-		25-32, 38-44, 46-5	•
=	8:14-20,24,7	13-37,45 ·	is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement
Claim(s)		:	1.1 05
Application Papers	programme to	substitute	_
See the attached N		ent Drawing Review, PTO-948.	
The drawing(s) filed			pjected to by the Examiner.
	ing correction, filed on		is _ approved _ disapproved
	objected to by the Examin		3
The oath or declara	tion is objected to by the E	xaminer.	*
Priority under 35 U.S.C), § 119	* - v	
Acknowledgment is	made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-	·(d).
All Some*	☐ None of the CERT	FIED copies of the priority docume	ents have been
received.			
received in App	plication No. (Series Code/ national stage application	Serial Number) from the International Bureau (PC	T Rule 17.2(a)).
*Certified copies not	received:		
Acknowledgment is	made of a claim for dome	stic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
Attachment(s)			
Notice of Reference	e Cited, PTO-892		•
☐ Information Disclos	sure Statement(s), PTO-14	49, Paper No(s).	
I Interview Summan	• •		·
Interview Summary Notice of Draftpers	• •		

-SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES-

Art Unit: 2506

The claims are misnumbered because there is no claim 45. Accordingly, claims 46-58 have been renumbered as claims 45-57, respectively.

Claims 5,6,25028, 48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 5, it is not clear what is meant by "binary values separately".

In claim 25, microbolometers should be microbolometer detector elements.

Claim 26 lacks proper antecedent basis for said microbolometer.

Claim 48 lacks proper antecedent basis for "the timemultiplexed readout".

In claim 55, amplification should be amplifying to provide proper antecedent basis.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

⁽e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2506

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1,7,10,11,21,23 42/44/46,49,50 and 53-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lung.

Lung provides offset correction by sampling signals at first and second time intervals with a sampling capacitor and subtracting the two signals. The sampling capacitors comprise means for storing a plurality of offset correction values corresponding to the plurality of elements.

Art Unit: 2506

Claims 9,12,13,22,25,29-32,38-41,47,48,51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lung.

It would have been obvious to facilitate assembly and maintenance by providing the detector array and readout circuit as a single monolithic integrated circuit. The use of output buffers would have depended on the intended applications. It would have been obvious to enhance versatility by providing means to adjust the reference voltage for the differential amplifiers. Use of a fixed voltage source for biasing is conventional.

Claims 1,5,6,12,21,22,53 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Masarik et al (see col. 4, lines 54-57 and figures 2b and 6).

Claims 9,10,13,25,29-31,38,41,54,55 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masarik et al.

It would have been obvious to simplify assembly and maintenance by structurally integrating the detector elements and readout circuit. The Marsarik et al focal plane array uses pyroelectric detectors, but it would have been obvious that their techniques of offset correction would apply to other types of infrared detectors used in a focal plane array, with the type of readout circuit used being dependent on the type of detector. They amplify detector signals before correcting, but it would have been obvious that the amplification step could have been provided after the correction, with such being an obvious design choice.

Art Unit: 2506

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nishita shows other teaching of using a memory to store offset correction data.

Claims 2-4,8,14-20,24,33-37 and 45 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 26 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Fields at telephone number (703) 308-4860.

Fields/jm

March 5,1997

CAROLYN E. FIELDS EXAMINER ART UNIT 256